

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application and claims 1-4 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for “each SDP handler operates in its inherent SDP” does not reasonably provide enablement for “first and second handler means for handling said first and second service discovery protocols”.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that “each service discovery protocol handler is disclosed as handling on specific protocol however the language of claim 1 implies that the first or second handler means is capable of handling both a first or second protocol”. Apparently the Examiner is confused by the passage of claim 1 which states

“first and second handler means for handling said first and second service discovery protocols, each of said first and second handler means including a conversion means for mutually converting service information between a format used in said first or second service discovery protocol handled in said first or second handler means and said common format,”

The passage now has been amended to read:

“first and second handler means for handling said first and second service discovery protocols, respectively, each of said first and second handler means including a conversion means for mutually converting service information between a format used in said first or second service discovery protocol handled in said first or second handler means, respectively, and said common format,”

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner objects to the preamble of the claim which states, “using a first service discovery protocol to discover a service information using a second service discovery protocol”. However, the Examiner suggests changing to phrase to read “an apparatus using a first service discovery protocol, to discover a service information ~~using~~ of a service that uses a second service discovery protocol different from said first service discovery protocol”.

Applicants accept the Examiner’s suggestion and claim 1 has been amended accordingly.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 implies that the “distinct service discovery protocols” are “written in a common format”. The Examiner suggests rewriting the claim to indicate that it is the service information in the common database that is written in a common format. Taking the Examiner’s comments into consideration, claim 1 has been amended.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/0003191 by Kovacs et al.

It should be noted that the grounds of rejection has changed since the last office action mailed October 27, 2005. The rejection now relies upon Kovacs et al. as the prior art.

The present invention is a server (10) able to communicate with different appliances using different SDPs (Service Discovery Protocol) using a common database (11). The common database (11) stores service information for service attributes provided by SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14). The service information stored in the common database (11) is written in a common format that can be understood by all SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14).

Kovacs et al. describes a communication device that operates multimedia applications in one or more communication networks. This device uses a computing manager unit (52) for managing and providing multimedia applications on the basis of a communication with one or more

communication devices in the one or more communication networks. A device discovery manager unit (58) detects the availability of one or more devices on one or more communication networks. A service discovery manager unit (56) provides available services from and for one or more communication networks. A virtual device manager unit (60) provides a graphical user interface for controlling devices and services of the one or more communication networks.

Paragraphs 68-71 of Kovacs et al. state.

“[0068] The service discovery manager sub-unit 56 provides an abstraction of various available service discovery mechanisms. Such mechanisms allow mobile multi media applications to:

[0069] detect the presence of services available in the given mobile ad-hoc network,

[0070] select the one that best fits the users needs based on service properties,

[0071] being notified whenever services are made available on the mobile ad-hoc network, are put out of service, or are simply modified in terms of service attributes.”

However, there is no reference in Kovacs et al. that describes the following features recited in claim 1.

“a common database for storing service information defined by a plurality of different and distinct service discovery protocols including said first and second service discovery protocols, in which the service information stored in the common database is written in a common format”

“each of said first and second handler means including a conversion means for mutually converting service information between a format used in said first or second service discovery protocol handled in said first or second handler means, respectively, and said common format”

“said conversion means does not convert the service information from said first or second service discovery protocol when the service information is in the same format as that contained in the common database and does convert the service information from said first or second service discovery protocol when the service information is not in the same format as that contained in said common database.”

Therefore, Applicants traverse the Examiner's grounds of rejection. The prior art of record simply fails to describe the above limitations recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/0003191 by Kovacs et al. is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/0003191 by Kovacs et al.

Claim is allowable by virtue of its dependence upon allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, in view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claim 1, as

amended, and dependent claims 2, 3 and 4, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 011735
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE